



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/757,762 | 01/14/2004 | Steven Maddocks | 200315423-1 | 4235 |

22879 7590 07/24/2009

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

KEATON, SHERROD L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2175

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/24/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

ipa.mail@hp.com

jessica.l.fusek@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/757,762
Filing Date: January 14, 2004
Appellant(s): MADDOCKS ET AL.

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 4-16-2009 appealing from the Office action mailed 11-14-2008.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Blumenau (US 6839747 B1) 6-30-1999

Basham et al. (US 6425059 B1) 12-11-1999

Dimitroff (US 6212606 B1) 11-13-1998

Yung et al. (US 2004/0032430 A1) 5-4-2003

Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) from specification

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau (6839747 B1) in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) and Basham et al ("Basham" 6425059 B1).

Claim 1: Blumenau discloses a storage network comprising:

an interface manager that interface manager aggregating configuration information in the automated storage system;

an interface application provided in computer readable storage at the interface manager, the interface application generating user interface rendering data for the configuration information

a graphical user interface operatively associated with the interface application, the graphical user interface outputting the configuration information in accordance with the user interface rendering data (abstract; Figure 14). A graphical user interface is shown that renders configuration information.

but does not explicitly disclose an automated storage system including data access drivers that perform read or write operations on a storage media and transfer robotics that transfer the storage media to the data access drives. However Applicants Admitted Prior Art discloses that these systems are commonly known (AAPA; Paragraph 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the addition of data access drivers and transfer robotics to Blumenau as taught by AAPA and also provide control access to these instruments. One would have been motivated to include access control to these instruments to expand operability and functionality of the system.

Nor does Blumenau explicitly disclose receiving user input to grant and deny access permissions for hosts to both the data access drives and to the transfer robotics.

However Basham discloses the grant/deny access of access drives and transfer robotics (Column 4, Lines 34-59 and Column 8, Lines 1-42). Therefore it a user does not have permission access to the drives he is also not permitted access to the robotics. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the access permissions in the modified Blumenau as taught by Basham. One would have been motivated to provide these permissions to improve access security to the system.

Claim 2: Blumenau, AAPA and Basham disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further discloses an interface application receiving the configuration information from a management pipeline at the interface manager (Blumenau: Column 24, Lines 38-54).

Claim 3: Blumenau, AAPA and Basham disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further disclose the interface application including a state machine to determine a state of the data access drivers and transfer robotics based at least in part on the configuration information (Blumenau: Column 29, Lines 57-67). Shows the state of which volume is accessible and so on.

Claim 4: Blumenau, AAPA and Basham disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further discloses the interface application including a render engine to

generate the user interface rendering information (Blumeanu: Figure 14; Column 17, Line 18-Column 18, Line 8; Column).

Claim 5: Blumenau, AAPA and Basham disclose a storage network as in Claims 1 and 8 above and disclose a graphical user interface displaying a logical map of the data access drivers and transfer robotics (Blumenau: Figure 14; Column 17, Line 61-Column 18, Line 8). Here Blumenau shows a topology (mapping) of the host connections and therefore shows the functionality of mapping devices of a system. AAPA provides the data access drivers and transfer robotics.

Claim 6: Blumenau, AAPA and Basham disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further disclose displaying access permissions for the data access drives and transfer robotics in table format (Blumenau: Figure 16; Column 30, Lines 49-63). The access drivers and transfer robotics are provided by AAPA.

Claim 7: Blumenau, AAPA and Basham disclose a storage network as in Claim 1 above and further disclose user input to deny and grant the access permissions by selecting one or more of the rows or columns in a window (Blumenau: abstract; Column 29, Line 57-Column 30, Line 19).

Claim 21: Similar in scope to Claim 1 and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 22: Blumenau, AAPA and Basham disclose a automated storage system as in claim 21, wherein the graphical user interface identifies the host and the data access drives so the user can change the access permissions between the hosts and the data access drives (Blumenau: abstract) identifies host and storage volumes and (AAPA and Basham) also provide explicit mention of data access drives.

Claim 23: Blumenau, AAPA and Basham disclose a automated storage system as in claim 21, wherein the graphical user interface provides a window that displays which of hosts are connected to which of the data access drives so the user can alter the access permissions between the hosts and the data access drives (Blumenau: Figures 21 and 22; Column 32, Lines 26-65).

Claims 8, 10-12, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau (6839747 B1) in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Claims 8 and 17: Blumenau discloses an automated storage system and method linked to a graphical user interface and method comprising:
aggregating configuration information at an interface manager for a plurality of system devices generating a user Interface rendering data at the interface manager; and

displaying the configuration information in an application window at the graphical user interface in accordance with the user interface rendering data and receiving user input in the application window to change access permissions of hosts (abstract; Figure 14). A graphical user interface is shown that renders configuration information.

but does not explicitly disclose including data access drives that receive movable storage media from transfer robotics in an automated storage system. However Applicants Admitted Prior Art discloses that these systems are commonly known (AAPA; Paragraph 3). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the addition of data access drivers and transfer robotics in the storage system of Blumenau as taught by AAPA. One would have been motivated to include these instruments to expand operability and functionality of the system.

Claim 9: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a storage network as in Claim 8 above and disclose a graphical user interface displaying a logical map of the data access drivers and transfer robotics (Blumenau: Figure 14; Column 17, Line 61-Column 18, Line 8). Here Blumenau shows a topology (mapping) of the host connections and therefore shows the functionality of mapping devices of a system. AAPA provides the data access drivers and transfer robotics.

Claim 10: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system as in Claim 8 above and further disclose displaying the access permissions for the system devices in the application window (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-60; Column 30, Lines 49-63).

Claim 11: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above and further discloses receiving the user input in the application window to grant and deny the hosts access to the data access drives and the transfer robotics (Blumenau: abstract; Figure 16; Column 17, Lines 44-60; Column 30, Lines 49-63). The access drivers and transfer robotics are provided by AAPA.

Claim 12: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above and further discloses receiving management commands for the system devices based on user input at the application window (Blumenau: abstract). User inputs allow management of the system with access permission.

Claim 18: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a method as in Claim 17 above and further disclose user selections from the graphical user interface to add and remove drives from the system devices (Blumenau: abstract; Column 17, Lines 44-60).

Claims 13-16, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau (6839747 B1) and Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) as applied to Claims 1, 8 and 17 above in further view of Dimitroff (US 6212606B1) and Yung et al (2004/0032430A1).

Claim 13: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose copying all access permissions for a first host selection to a second host selection in the application window. However Yung discloses a function of cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing host and devices having shared capabilities (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to use the functionality of the cut, copy, paste to copy the access and security parameters of the first host to be copied to a second host in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to copy

access permissions in order to allow the two host shared access and security improving functionality of the system.

Claim 14: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose removing all access permissions for at least one host selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow removing of access and security parameters of a host in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to remove access permissions in order to allow improved user operability to edit, reorder or allow open access to that host.

Claim 15: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose copying all access permissions for a first device selection to a second device selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices

(Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to use the functionality of the cut, copy, paste to copy the access and security parameters of the first device to be copied to a second device in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to copy access permissions in order to allow the two host shared access and security improving functionality and efficiency of the system.

Claim 16: Blumenau and AAPA disclose an automated storage system linked to a graphical user interface and method as in Claim 8 above but does not explicitly disclose removing all access permissions for at least one device selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow removing of access and security parameters of a device in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to remove access permissions in order to allow improved user operability to edit, reorder or allow open access to that host.

Claim 19: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a user selection from the graphical user interface to edit access permissions to the system devices as in Claim 18 above but does not explicitly disclose copying and pasting access permissions for a first host selection to a second host selection in the application window. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions in the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing the shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow the access and security parameters of the first host to be copied to a second host in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to allow copy and pasting of access permissions to add efficiency to the process.

Claim 20: Blumenau and AAPA disclose a user selection from the graphical user interface to edit access permissions to the system devices as in Claim 18 above but does not explicitly disclose copying and pasting access permissions for a first system device to a second system device. However Yung does disclose cut, copy and paste functions in the application window (Fig 5B and 5C) and Dimitroff discloses the security and access parameters for a storage system containing shareability of the host and devices (Column 3, Lines 34-54), (Column 4, Lines 6-67), (Column 5, Lines 1-60), (Fig. 1). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to allow the access and security parameters of the first device to

Art Unit: 2175

be copied to a second device in the modified Blumenau as taught by Dimitroff and Yung. One would have been motivated to allow copy and pasting of access permissions to add efficiency to the process.

(10) Response to Argument

Applicants have argued that the prior art of record which includes AAPA, Blumenau and Yung do not disclose access permission functionality as cited by claim 1. However applicant has failed to also consider Basham which is also cited (Column 4, Lines 34-59 and Column 8, Lines 1-42) which further discloses the functionality that would control access to both the storage slot and robotics. Basham discloses a storage system which also includes robotics (robotic arm). The system checks access rights and based on those access rights controller will allow the robotic arm to access the storage slot or send an error message denying the robotic arm from accessing storage slot. Further, claim language for granting and denying access permissions to the drives and transfer robotics do not require individual and separate access rights to each device as seems to be argued by the applicant. The claim only requires that access to both devices be restricted as shown by Basham (Column 8, Lines 1-42).

In response to claim 5, applicants argue the logical mapping of the access drives and transfer robotics is not provided. Examiner disagrees. Blumenau discloses a storage system and also provides the functionality of mapping access rights for the storage system devices (Figure 14). The combination of the additional prior art (AAPA and Basham) provide the other devices such as a robotic arm and other access permission functionality. This is an obvious combination to one of ordinary skill in the art and provides a complete storage system. The incorporation of the references provides the mapping functionality and devices to be mapped.

In response to claim 6, the combination of references which provides the complete system is addressed in response to claim 5, and Blumenau further discloses a table format (row and column setup) in (Figure 14, 1420). Applicants argue that system provides a finer level of control however the claim is very incomplete when it comes to disclosing how their table format would provide this functionality over the prior art.

In response to claim 7, Blumenau discloses that selecting one of the volumes in the table allows user to edit access (Column 30, Lines 6-9). Again applicants argue that system provides a finer level of control and visualization however the claim is very incomplete when it comes to disclosing how their system would provide this functionality over the prior art.

In response to claims 22 and 23, Blumenau discloses in the abstract and through Figure 14, a detailed graphical representation of host and storage (drive) connections. The functionality of allowing and denying access provides the ability to edit permissions in a GUI.

In response to Claim 8 and 11, Blumenau discloses a storage system and also provides the functionality of mapping access rights for the storage system devices (Figure 14). It is obvious that storage system can include additional devices and the combination of the additional prior art (AAPA) provides the other devices such as a robotic arm and other functionality. This is an obvious combination to one of ordinary skill in the art and provides a complete storage system. The incorporation of the references provides the access functionality and devices for which to access. Further, claim language for granting and denying access permissions to the drives and transfer

robotics do not require individual and separate access rights to each device as seems to be argued by the applicant. The claim only requires that editing access affects both devices.

Lastly applicants argue the rationale for combination. Examiner believes that all prior art is proper because they all utilize a storage device system. The storage device may operate under different areas but are still in the storage system art; also none of the references provide any negative language into modifying or utilizing different storage functionalities. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sherrod Keaton/

Examiner, Art Unit 2175 (7/16/2009)

Conferees:

William L. Bashore

/William L. Bashore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2175

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174